DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 304 CG 006 688

AUTHOR Kelly, Eugene W., Jr.
TITLE Changes in Racial Prejudice and Dogmatism as a Result of Interracial Counselor Training Experiances.
INSTITUTION South Carolina Univ., Columbia.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 71
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., April 4-8, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; *Counselor Attitudes; *Counselor Training; Disadvantaged Groups; Dogmatism; *Institutes (Training Programs); Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Discrimination; Racism; T Groups

ABSTRACT

After failing to obtain a change in racial attitudes during an initial counselor training institute, changes were made for a subsequent institute. The second institute eliminated large group sessions, emphasized small group encounter and provided biracial leadership in each small group. Some participants also received special training in genuineness. Results of the second institute indicated that at the end of the institute whites expressed significantly less prejudice toward Negroes, one small group showed significantly less global social distance, and members of the genuineness training group expressed significantly less racial prejudice as well as global social distance. (Author)

ED055304

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CHANGES IN RACIAL PREJUDICE AND DOGMATISM AS A RESULT OF INTERRACIAL COUNSELOR TRAINING EXPERIENCES

by
Eugene W. Kelly, Jr.
University of South Carolina

Paper Presented at
American Personnel and Guidance Association National Convention
Atlantic City, N. J.
April 7, 1971

During the spring semester of 1969 the South Carolina School Desegregation Consulting Center sponsored a field course in cross-racial counseling for approximately 40 South Carolina public school counselors. The enthusiastic response with which this course was received prompted the Desegregation Center to sponsor a similar institute that same summer and try to measure more precisely the effects of such an experience.

The 1969 summer institute was designed to achieve basically three objectives:

(1) an increase in interracial understanding, sensitivity, concern and communication among participants;

(2) a greater knowledge of important information related to counseling the disadvantaged and counseling across racial lines;

(3) the beginning development of skills for cross-racial counseling and counseling the disadvantaged.

There were 43 participants in the 1969 summer institute, including 20 Black females, six Black males, 13 White females, and six White males. Twenty-nine were full-time counselors and twelve were part-time counselors; two were not counselors. Co-instructors for the institute were two White male counselor educators, one Black male Director of Guidance and

CG 006 688

Counseling on the college level, and one White female ABD counselor educator.

In order to achieve the objectives of the institute, three basic forms of activities were provided:

(1) large group lectures and discussions which were aimed primarily at imparting information related to counseling the disadvantaged and cross-racial counseling;

(2) small group discussions directed primarily toward increasing interracial understanding and communication;

(3) outside readings and short written assignments.

The institute ran for three weeks, five days a week, three hours a day. The total time of the institute was divided about equally between large group and small group activities. Large group sessions were primarily for the purpose of sharing and discussing information. For small group discussions, the total group was randomly divided into four small groups, each of which had one of the co-instructors as a leader. Discussion in the small groups was directed toward increasing honesty of expression across racial lines and the development of genuine understanding and caring.

The three dependent variables chosen to measure the effectiveness of the institute were racial prejudice, global social distance and dogmatism. The first two were measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and dogmatism was measured by the Robeach Dogmatism Scale, Form E. The decision to use the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was based on its wide use as a measure of prejudice or the expressed willingness of an individual to associate with persons of different groups, as well as its use in at least two studies on counselor effectiveness. A measure of dogmatism

was taken because of its relationship to racial prejudice and counselor effectiveness.

All participants in this first summer institute completed both research instruments four times: three weeks prior to the beginning of the institute, on the first and last days of the institute, and four months after the institute ended. As analyses of repeated measures were run on all three dependent variables, once with the factor of race and once with the factor of small group leaders. On the basis of planned comparisons, t tests were conducted to determine the effectiveness of the institute and one to determine the persistence of any effects through the follow-up period.

Analysis of the data showed that, according to the variables measured the institute was generally not effective. The only statistically significant positive results showed that the members of the small group led by the Black Director of Guidance and Counseling showed less global social distance by the end of the follow-up period. Other suggested but non-significant results ($p < .10$) included less global social distance by Whites at the end of the follow-up period, a tendency for Whites to be less prejudiced toward Blacks at the end of the follow-up period (although Blacks continued to be less prejudiced toward Whites than vice versa), and a tendency for Blacks to be more open-minded by the end of the institute, although this gain was eliminated by the end of the follow-up period.

The results were particularly disappointing in view of the importance of the issues involved in the institute and the amount of resources expended to make it a reality. The generally negative results could have been due to one or more of several factors, including inappropriate or weak experiences or balance of experiences provided for the participants,

ineffective leadership, inappropriate dependent variables, inappropriate instruments for measuring the variables, or too much heterogeneity among the participants.

A second training institute for counselors was held during the summer of 1970. Because of the negative results obtained on the first summer institute, a decision was made to change the experiences which the participants would have, to provide broader and more intense leadership, to obtain different dependent measures, and to obtain a somewhat more select group of participants.

The kinds of experiences provided during the institute, and the type and extent of leadership offered, has been explained elsewhere. It is sufficient to note for the purposes of this paper that the second institute was the same length as the first, but very little time was spent in large group activities, the bulk of time being devoted to small group encounter activities. Another noteworthy difference was that during the 1970 institute some of the participants received special intense training in genuineness.

There were 24 participants in the 1970 summer institute, all but three of whom were full-time public school counselors. Participants included eight Black females, eight White females, four Black males and four White males. Each small group had co-leaders: group A a Black male and white Female; group B a white male and Black female.

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Robeach Dogmatism Scale were not used for dependent measures in this second institute. The Bogardus Scale was not used because it was judged to be too gross along the positive end of the social choice continuum, thereby being insensitive to small positive change. To replace the Bogardus Scale, this author

devised a simliar scale, but one which had finer distinctions in the positive end of the scale. This scale was called a Social Relations Scale. To devise the scale, eight social distance statements were given to 15 judges and they were asked to rate the statements according to the degree of social distance that each represented. An average score for each statement was obtained, ambiguities that caused two pairs of statements to receive nearly similar ratings were eliminated, and a final scale of six statements was constructed and entitled "A Social Relations Scale."

The dogmatism measure was eliminated from the research on the second institute because it was judged to represent a variable somewhat removed from the central focus of the institute. In its place was substituted the Anti-Negro/Anti-White Scales originally devised by George A. Streckler. The items from both these scales were combined with certain items from the California F Scale, and a final single scale was constructed which was entitled "An Opinionnaire Inventory."

From the Social Relations Scale two scores were obtained: a total social relations score which involved responses to a number of ethnic and cultural groups in the United States, and a specific Black-White prejudice score obtained from responses to these groups alone. From the Opinionnaire Inventory a prejudice score was obtained for Whites from the anti-Negro items and a prejudice score for Blacks from the anti-White items.

All the participants completed both instruments three weeks prior to the opening of the institute, at the beginning of the institute and again at the end of the institute. A follow-up measure was not obtained. For various reasons, instruments from six participants had to be discarded, leaving 18 subjects for the final analysis, including seven Black females,

six White females, four Black males and one White male. Analyses of repeated measures were run for the three dependent variables, once with the factor of race, once with the factor of small group membership, and once with the factor of training or non-training in genuineness. On the basis of planned comparisons, several t tests were conducted to examine more closely the effects of the institute.

Results showed that with regards to specifically Black/White and White/Black social distance scores, Blacks were significantly less prejudiced than Whites at the beginning of the institute and although they remained somewhat less prejudiced at the end, Whites had become significantly less prejudiced by the end of the institute ($t = 4.23$, $df = 32$, $p < .001$). With regards to global social distance scores, there was no significant differences between Blacks and Whites, but in terms of movement, the members of one small group led by a Black male and White female showed significantly less global social distance ($t = 1.73$, $df = 32$, $p < .05$) and the members of the genuineness training group also showed significantly less global social distance ($t = 4.64$, $df = 32$, $p < .001$). With regards to the prejudice scores from the Opinionnaire Inventory, although an initial examination of the results seem to indicate some positive movement, within subject scores were too erratic to allow much significant results. Initial Opinionnaire prejudice scores showed that Blacks were significantly less prejudiced than Whites, but this difference narrowed somewhat by the end of the institute. A significant interaction on these Opinionnaire prejudice scores with the factor of genuineness training/non-training ($F = 3.88$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$) indicated that whereas the genuineness training group was considerably more prejudiced than the non-trained group at the beginning of the institute, the genuineness training group

was considerably less prejudiced by the end of the institute.

These results, while not without some disappointing aspects, indicate that the 1970 summer institute for counselors in cross-racial counseling was more effective than the prior institute in reducing the expressed prejudice of Whites for Blacks and in the case of one small group the global social distance of both races. A specific training in genuineness of expression was indicated to be considerably helpful in reducing global social distance and expressed anti-white/anti-black prejudice. With the participants involved in this institute, Blacks generally were less prejudiced than Whites before and after the institute, but Whites made significant progress toward less prejudice. The strength of these results are, of course, limited by the small number of subjects involved in the research. Nevertheless, it may be that through an intensification of sustained interracial experiences, such as were had in this institute, with special consideration on genuineness of expression, Whites in particular can be progressively freed of their racial prejudices.

I

Mean Social Distance Scores for
Negroes on Whites and Whites on Negroes

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
N on W (11)	13.18	13.18	13.63
W on N (8)	6.86	6.57	10.29

Anaylsis of Repeated Measures on Overall
Social Distance Scores of N on W & W on N

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (N vs W)	1	378.19	13.47	$< .005$
Subjs w. grps.	16	28.07		
Within subjs.	36			
Tests	2	16.72	10.16	$< .001$
Grps. x Tests	2	13.94	8.47	$< .005$
Tests x subs w. grps	32	1.65		

Planned t test comparison: $(M_1-M_2) - \left[\left(\frac{M_1 + M_2}{2}\right) - M_3\right]$

N on W:		p: ns
W on N:	t = 4.23	$p < .001$

II

Mean Overall Social Distance Scores
for Total Group, Negroes, and Whites

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
Total Group (18)	10.50	10.46	11.75
Negroes (11)	11.17	11.29	12.46
Whites (7)	9.45	9.16	10.68

Analysis of Repeated Measures on Overall
Social Distance Scores with the Factor of Race

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (N vs W)	1	44.49	1.81	ns
Subjs w Grps	16	24.64		
Within subjs.	36			
Tests	2	9.63	2.61	$<.10$
Grps x Tests	2	0.24	0.06	ns
Tests x subj w. grps	32	3.68		

Planned t test comparisons:

All ns

III

Mean Overall Social Distance
Scores for Two Small Groups

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
A-Gunn (9)	10.50	11.23	13.13
B-McKenzie (9)	10.49	9.69	10.27

Analysis of Repeated Measures on Overall
Social Distance Scores with Factor of Small Groups

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (A x B)	1	29.30	1.15	ns
Subjs w. grps	16	25.42		
Within subjs	36			
Tests	2	8.97	2.87	$<.10$
Grps x Tests	2	9.16	2.93	$<.10$
Tests x subjs w. grps	32	3.13		

Planned t test comparison:

Group A: $t = 1.73$; $df = 32$; $p < .05$
Group B: ns

IV

Mean Overall Social Distance Scores for Genuineness Training Group and Non-Trained Group

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
Gen Training (7)	10.41	9.78	12.16
N-Gen Training (11)	10.56	10.89	11.41

Analysis of Repeated Measures on Overall Social Distance Scores with Factor G and NG Training Groups

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (G vs NG)	1	2.22	0.04	ns
Subjs w grps	16	51.57		
Within subjs	36			
Tests	2	16.72	6.91	$<.005$
Grps X Tests	2	1.55	0.64	ns
Tests x subjs w. grps	34	2.42		

Planned t Test Comparisons:

G.T. Group: $t = 4.64$; $df = 32$; $p < .001$
NGT Group: ns

V

Mean Prejudice Scores for Total Group, Negroes, and Whites

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
Total Group (18)	49.56	49.89	48.89
Negroes (11)	44.82	44.73	47.00
Whites (7)	57.00	58.00	51.86

Analysis of Repeated Measures for Prejudice Scores with Factor of Race

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (N vs W)	1	1310.14	5.62	< .05
Subjs w grps	16	232.95		
Within subjs	36			
Tests	2	4.67	0.05	ns
Grps x tests	2	89.59	0.96	ns
Tests x subj w. grps	32	93.36		

Planned t Test Comparisons:

All ns

VI

Mean Prejudice Scores for Two Small Groups

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
A-Gunn (9)	52.22	54.67	48.78
B-McKenzie (9)	46.89	45.11	49.00

Analysis of Repeated Measures on
Prejudice Scores with Factor of Small Groups

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps (A x B)	1	322.67	1.10	ns
Subjs w. grps	16	294.67		
Within subjs	36			
Tests	2	4.67	0.05	ns
Grps x Tests	2	108.22	1.17	ns
Tests x subjs w. grps	32	92.19		

Planned t Test Comparisons:

All ns

VII

Mean Prejudice Scores for Genuineness Training Group and Non-Trained Group

	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3
Gen Training (7)	55.43	51.86	42.71
N-Gen Training (11)	45.82	48.64	49.37

Analysis of Repeated Measures on Prejudice Scores with Factor of G and NG Training Groups

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between subjs	17			
Grps. (G vs NG)	1	54.49	0.20	ns
Subjs w grps	16	267.53		
Within subjs	36			
Tests	2	52.52	0.71	ns
Grps x Tests	2	287.06	3.88	$< .05$
Tests x subjs w. grps	34	74.07		

Planned t Test Comparisons

All ns